Professionalizing the Senses: Art and Music History in Vienna, 1890-1920

Since about 1880 there has been a significant change in the way we talk about art and music, and, in particular, the way art and music are spoken about in academic institutions. We now largely undertake studies of art and music under the rubric of historical style and use the category of style as a limiting concept, both temporal and technical, to explain, evaluate, and understand the work of art. One particular sense of style, which may be described as the structural-historical, came to prominence at the end of the last century as the result of attempts by art and music historians to carve out for themselves an interpretive, social, and institutional space atop that Olympus of academia, the German—here specifically the Viennese—*Universität*.

The Viennese disciplines of art and music history did not, of course, spring from the minds of their founding fathers fully formed and already sanctified but required the confluence of a set of workable ideas, a group of willing actors, and a responsive environment—one in which the opening of new archives, museums and archaeological sites provided an impetus to the development of new methods for locating, dating, and authenticating objects. Athena was born wearing armor; art and music history were not, and their struggle to out-evaluate connoisseurs and critics, out-explain polyhistorians, and out-understand philosophers of aesthetics led to their engagement of otherwise loosely related auxiliary troops. Philology, numismatics, paleography, diplomatics, and ethnography were merely the acknowledged extra forces of historical methodologies which incorporated contemporary scientific schemata ranging from evolutionary biology to psychopathology. Yet art and music history were to be very peculiar "sciences."[1] Often educated alongside artists and enmeshed in the world of exhibitions and entertainment, the art and music historian in Austria before World War I was a figure in the middle—between the art world and the university, between private patronage and governmental support. By the 1920s, however, the art expert had become thoroughly bureaucratized, academized, and professionalized, and his scientific method, too, had undergone fundamental change.

Intent on devising a defensible scientific method and an autonomous body of subject matter, Austrian and German scholars of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries conceived style as an empirically investigable structure whose internal architecture was, however, obvious only to the trained eye and ear. Style, as never before, became a crystallization of typical

[1] "Science" and "scientific" will be used throughout this paper in the German sense of *Wissenschaft* and *wissenschaftlich* to denote scholarly and rigorous attributes not confined to the natural sciences.

elements, an invented standard by which to ascertain the historical importance of works of art. Style preserved for the work of art a stable, historical authenticity, social function, and significance in a world of artists alienated from conventions, both tonal and representational, and a world of critics lacking a coherent aesthetic standard, formal or social.

Criticism of style also preserved for the scholar of the arts a precise (academic) authority, social space, and interpretive territory. The historicizing and reclassifying of conventional forms and figures into "styles" employed not the aristocratic aesthete but the cultural mandarin, whose elite status, as Fritz Ringer suggests, depended on educational rather than hereditary or monetary qualifications. Style as a subject for taxonomic organization and as an object of exegetical interpretation became the staple for a mandarinate concerned with what Ringer calls "upholding the intellectual diet of the elite."[2] "Scientific" stylistic inquiry served as the insulating strategy of the academic historian of the arts against the intrusion of amateurs as well as the defense-plan of the art lover against the dissolution of a standard of taste.

This structural-historical conception of style is still with us, as a classificatory principle if nothing else. Recently the concept of style has become the focus for key methodological debates amongst art and music historians, not least because of its central role in professionalizing the discipline.[3] If the argument advanced here is correct, it will be very difficult for art or music history to abandon structural-historical analysis of style without the disciplines undergoing major transformation. The purpose here, then, is to seek the origins, intellectual and institutional, of this notion of style and to attempt to see how this understanding came to be legitimized as *the* way scholars were to make sense of images and pieces of music. Here the examination of this development will be limited to the study of a single, but seminal, locale, Vienna, and attention will be focused on the work of a single pair of scholars, the art historian Max Dvořák and the music historian Guido Adler.[4]

For Vienna, "style" was a concern not simply sartorial but also cultural and moral, as clearly evidenced, for example, in Hermann Broch's Biblical condemnations of the "museumishness" and vacuousness of Viennese non-

[2]Fritz K. Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarins* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960), p. 5.

[3]Arnold Hauser, in *The Philosophy of Art History* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1985) gives an extensive description of the double genesis of style analysis and art history. For some recent discussion see the essays collected in Berel Lang, ed., *The Concept of Style* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2nd edition, 1987). Norman Bryson, *Word and Image* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1981), Nelson Goodman, *Languages of Art* (Indianapolis, Ind.: Hackett Publishing Co., 1976), Charles Rosen, *The Classical Style* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1971).

[4]I owe the original idea of this juxtaposition to William A. Johnston. See his short treatment of the Vienna School in *The Austrian Mind* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), pp. 151-155.

style style. For Broch, as for the Viennese historian of the arts, the coherence of past historical styles suggested social harmony, the organic integration of the individual parts and the whole. Salvaging and representing to contemporary audiences the works of the past, particularly the Austrian past, the historian of style investigated and verified a cultural continuity which he, like his great predecessor Jakob Burckhardt, feared had been forgotten and forsaken. For Dvořák and Adler, additionally, style was an occupational instrument, a means to transcend subjective aesthetics and to gain scientific mastery over a mass of diverse material; they were two of the first to make style operative in this fashion and an inquiry into their genesis should throw much light on the origins of these new cultural mandarins and their style-historical method.

> For me, the lectern was an altar, at which I performed my duty.[5]
>
> Guido Adler

> For when in the public eye, men who dedicate themselves to the study of art of the past on the basis of their ideals and in order to serve the public are not sharply differentiated from those who use their familiarity with marketable artistic works in order to take a percentage, we lose our way and sooner or later forfeit the right to speak in the name of science and to represent ethical imperatives and civic responsibilities in the realm of past art.[6]
>
> Max Dvořák

Max Dvořák (1874-1921) and Guido Adler (1855-1941) were Viennese scholars. They were also Viennese bureaucrats extraordinaire. Both men conducted extremely popular lecture-courses at the University of Vienna, founded, edited, and contributed to numerous journals, published influential articles and books, attended conferences all over Europe, acted as directors for Viennese museums and music institutions, served on state commissions, occasionally wrote pieces for the daily press, publicly and privately championed their friends in the art world, organized exhibitions and festivals, and assisted in the establishment of professional organizations for those employed in the arts. Dvořák was Czech, his father a Czech historian and caretaker of a castle in Bohemia. Adler was Jewish, his father's early death forced the large family to leave Eibenschütz, where Adler's father had been a doctor, and to resettle with relatives in Iglau. Thus both Adler and Dvořák, at the outset, stood apart from the Austrian academic culture they were later to dominate. Their curiously parallel acts of assimilation in the 1880s, in fact, are good demonstrations of the qualities Viennese culture required of its mandarins. Dvořák moved from Prague to Vienna, from Czech history (in

[5]Guido Adler, *Wollen und Wirken* (Vienna: Universal-Edition, 1935), p. 38.

[6]Max Dvořák, "Sollen die Deutschen Kunsthistoriker sich zu einer Fachgenossenschaft zusammenschliessen?", *Kunstchronik*, XXVII, n. s., no. 35 (June 1917), 369.

Czech) to Gothic and baroque art history (in German). Adler abandoned the anti-establishment *Wagner Verein*, took a teaching position in Vienna under Wagner's foremost critic, Eduard Hanslick, and published the baroque compositions of four Kaisers. Both lives ended in dark days—Dvořák succumbed to the after-effects of famine in 1921, still struggling to preserve the Viennese collections that he had worked so hard to establish; Adler is reported to have died alone and unnoticed in 1941 in wartime Vienna.[7]

There are, then, a number of interesting parallels in the lives of these two men. Yet their most significant similarity lies in the role each played in the building and legitimizing of his respective discipline. In Viennese academic life, there were music historians before Adler and art historians before Dvořák. Yet these two belong to the first generation of those scholars for whom the precarious status of the discipline was an occupational hazard. As self-styled experts on subjects long regarded as mere aristocratic edification or entertainment, they were compelled to prove the seriousness of their projects without allowing themselves to be subsumed under already existing disciplines like philosophy or polyhistory and without permitting their fields to be circumscribed by the practical demands of cataloging art or emending scores.

In the late nineteenth century, the first line of this defense entailed an attempt to constitute a rigorous methodology which could, like an experimental science, perform tests on an autonomous body of subject matter and obtain objectively valid results. Adler and Dvořák insisted time and again on the scientific nature of their studies and the necessity that trained specialists alone be allowed to monitor the morphologies of art and music. The necessity of the educated ear and the well-trained eye took on the quality of ethical imperatives; Adler and Dvořák were committed to scientific scholarship, not merely employed in it, and never abandoned their faith that art and music history, as autonomous *Wissensgebiete*, required the greatest possible scientific expertise and demanded the highest conceivable professional integrity.

The second declaration of independence, from subservience to the demands of technical training institutions, took form as art and music historians began to participate more visibly and vigorously in public life. Music and art in late nineteenth-century Vienna had taken on new social significance as cultural life became more and more the realm in which the imperial bureaucracy expected national unity to be fostered. As governmental investment in the arts burgeoned with the building on the Ringstrasse, preservation societies and musical *Lager* assumed the status of quasi-political forces; their debates over architectural restoration and concert fare now involved not only

[7]See Carl Engel's report on Adler's death in "Guido Adler in Retrospect (1855-1941)," *The Musical Quarterly*, XXVII (1941), 391.

aesthetics but also imperial appointments.[8] Yet for Dvořák and Adler, neither public interest, responsive to the subjective whims of feuilletonists, nor sales registered by the art dealer, fluctuating with capricious changes in taste, could establish the "value" of a work of art. Art must be understood and appreciated objectively, they argued, on its own terms, in its own time frame, for its significance in its own day. In short, art must be appreciated *historically*. The historian, not the journalist chatterbox or dilettante connoisseur, was to be the model of the man of cultivated taste.

As subjects of specific inquiry, both art and music have long pedigrees. The history of art is traceable at least as far back as Johann Winckelmann, the history of music (in German) to J. N. Förkel, both in the third quarter of the eighteenth century.[9] Before this time, writings on art and music were generally appendages of philosophical inquiries or recipes for beauty; the closest cousin to the historical study was the biography, in the manner of Vasari or, in music, Wolfgang Printz. When histories did appear, they did not come from historians, much less art or music historians: Winckelmann was a self-trained classical philologist; Förkel was a Göttingen philosopher. In the nineteenth century, the study of art and music history long remained the province of technical instructors, on the one hand, and philosophers, on the other. The struggle for "akademische Selbstverwaltung" began only in the latter half of the century and was shaped by complex and protracted social and intellectual metamorphoses which can only be sketched below.

By about 1860, two rather different methods for writing the history of art as an autonomous, developmental process had been proposed. Karl Schnaase, a thorough-going Hegelian, attempted to free the aesthetic significance of the work of art from its material function and contingent value. Schnaase's method accorded the visual arts an independent dialectic, propelled by what Michael Podro has termed "the problem and solution" model of inquiry; stylistic continuity was conceived of as a process of setting and solving artistic problems.[10] In contrast, Gottfried Semper proclaimed a "practical" aesthetic which described art as a technical endeavor, not purely

[8]For a comprehensive description of debates over the visual arts from the *Vormärz* to the *fin de siècle*, see Elisabeth Springer, *Geschichte und Kulturleben der Wiener Ringstrasse* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1979). On the musical world, see William Weber, "Wagner, Wagnerism and Musical Idealism," in *Wagnerism in European Culture and Politics*, David C. Large and William Weber, eds. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984) and William McGrath, *Dionysian Art and Populist Politics in Austria* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).

[9]Warren Dwight Allen, *Philosophers of Music History* (New York: American Book Company, 1939), p. 83. Allen cites two English music historians, Sir John Hawkins and Sir Charles Burney, as predecessors of Förkel.

[10]Michael Podro, *The Critical Historians of Art* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), p. 37.

reflective. An architect, museum founder and philosophical Herbartian, Semper saw his task in *Der Stil in den technischen und tektonischen Künsten* (1860-1863) as that of "seeking out in the process of the origination and the evolution of art works the developing lawfulness and order in details."[11] In search of a basic language of building technique, Semper looked to the minor arts for *Urmotifs* whose formal structures had been replicated in various media. Semper, whose taxonomy of the arts may well have been inspired by Georges Cuvier's exhibit of animal skeletons at the Jardin des Plantes,[12] considered formal beauty a function of symmetry, proportion, and line and studied style as a sort of dynamics of design.

Semper's attention to dynamics of design was paralleled in the archeaological and paleographical researches of his day that carefully inspected and ordered changes in detail as a method for dating, locating, and determining the authenticity of unidentified artifacts or documents. This stylistic categorization and discerning of "the master's hand" also suggested to a mid-century eccentric Italian senator that an objective basis could be established for connoisseurship, that the original and the addition, the innovator and the copyist, could be scientifically separated. Giovanni Morelli, a medically trained Italian aesthete who published books in German under a Russian pseudonym, outlined a procedure for the connoisseur that relied on the recognition of subconscious mannerisms in the artist's portrayal of details such as the shape of an ear or a hand. For Morelli, inexpressive details betrayed neither conscious manipulation nor precise naturalistic replication but did reflect a consistent repetition of learned forms. Because the artist's perception of the world was mediated by these conventional patterns, the shape of an ear lobe, for example, could be used to identify the period and even the painter of the piece. The master, as Edgar Wind describes, could be discerned "not by the power with which he moves us, nor by the importance of what he has to say, but by the nervous twitch and the slight stammer which are just a little different from the quirks of his imitators."[13] Behavioral norms could be established in painting as in psychopathology; the meticulous eye could detect the artistic personality or the unsuspecting forger at the moment of least awareness, and thereby, precisely, demonstrate its objective quality. This objectivity, then, would provide much-needed foundations for an otherwise arbitrary practice. "Without these studies of form and detail," wrote

[11]Gottfried Semper, *Der Stil in den technischen und tektonischen Künsten*, vol. I (Munich: Friedrich Bruckmans Verlag, 1878), p. viii.

[12]Rosemary Bletter, "Post to Pillar" (review of Wolfgang Hermann, *Gottfried Semper*), *Times Literary Supplement*, no. 4,321 (January 24, 1986), p. 97.

[13]Edgar Wind, "Critique of Connoisseurship," in *Art and Anarchy* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1985), p. 38.

Morelli in 1877, "our so-called 'science of art' will never be more than a building reared on sand."[14]

That Morelli's science of art purported to be an objective method for the study of the history of art as well as a technique for curatorial precision is an important phenomenon, for it was to men interested in both of these aspects that Morelli's theories appealed. The Italian senator's ideas came to Vienna through the *Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, an organization established in 1854 under the direction of Minister Leo Thun-Hohenstein. Thun, seeking to reform the Austrian university system to encompass the "Lehr- und Lernfreiheit" and "akademische Selbstverwaltung" of Prussian schools while preserving Catholic predominance, chose Albert Jäger, a Tirolean Benedictine, as the *Institut*'s first director.[15] Thun's *Hochschulpolitik*, in general, aimed at the replacement of Josephistic *Naturrecht* with an historical conception of the foundations of law and the state; the eighteenth-century ideal of *Nationalerziehung* was to be recast on the composite model of the German university, the Russian Archaeological Commission, and the French *École des chartes*, in the hopes of lending historical legitimacy to the politics of *Großösterreich*.[16]

Clearly the *École des chartes*, "consacrée à l'étude approfondie de tous les monuments originaux de nôtre histoire,"[17] was the model for the *Institut für Geschichtsforschung*; both programs directed students toward acquisition of the specialized knowledge and skills necessary for employment in archives, libraries, and museums. The historical *Institut*, as Thun and his indefatigable art advisor Rudolf Eitelberger wished, built on non-philosophical traditions of painstaking inspection; numismatics, archaeology, philology, paleography, heraldics, and chronology made up the historical curriculum.[18] *Großösterreichisch* politics and the positivistic precision of the organization's foremost member, Theodor von Sickel, confined the researches of the early *Institut* chiefly to non-controversial documentation and restoration. Throughout the nineteenth century, the *Institut* remained chary of *Universalgeschichte*, Hegelian philosophy, and metaphysics in general; not until 1870 were philology and history made separate subjects, and

[14]Giovanni Morelli, *Italian Masters in German Galleries*, Louise M. Richter, trans. (London: George Bell & Sons, 1883), p. 442.

[15]Hans Lentze, *Die Universitätsreform des Minister Graf Leo Thun-Hohenstein* (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1962), p. 26; Alphons Lhotsky, *Österreichische Historiographie* (Vienna: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik, 1962), p. 165.

[16]Lhotsky, *Österreichische Historiographie*, pp. 158-164 *passim*.

[17]*Ibid.*, p. 165.

[18]*Ibid.*, p. 136. See also Taras von Borodajkewycz, "Aus der Frühzeit der Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte," in Karl Oettinger and Mohammed Rassem, eds., *Festschrift für Hans Sedlmayr* (Munich: C. H. Beck Verlag, 1962), pp. 321-348.

heraldic, iconographic, and paleographic pursuits long remained the central focus of study.

Morelli's method was introduced to the *Institut* by Moriz Thausing, who was the institute's first art historian and, it is significant to note, was also curator of the Albertina collection of sketches. Thausing combined Sickel's paleography with Morelli's iconography, yielding a "science" which ignored content and looked for historical traces in form alone.[19] Thausing's studies of structure, as Max Dvořák later asserted, simply made authenticating, locating, and dating operations historical ones as well, making it possible "to elevate, on an objective basis, historical research to the status (*Höhe*) of an experimental science."[20]

Despite Thun's efforts, the *Institut* was simply one of a number of cultural interest groups struggling to make its voice heard. Although many members of the *Institut* faculty also taught regular courses at the university, they did not yet enjoy the privileged status of official experts or mandarin policy-advisors. Their relatively weak position was evident, for example, in the quarrel over the restoration of the *Riesentor* of St. Stephan's Cathedral. In 1882, Thausing and some of his students attempted to quash a plan backed by the *Wiener Dombauverein* to remove the Gothic additions to the Romanesque portal. Although construction was postponed, Thausing's reputation was tarnished, and he was soon dismissed from the directorship of the Albertina.[21] Thausing was perhaps the last of the art historians to incur such official opprobrium; when his student Alois Riegl took up the *Riesentor* cause twenty years later, it was Thausing's Building Society opponents who fell into disfavor. In 1884, a year of transition for the art-historical mandarins, the university (and the *Institut*) moved onto the Ringstrasse, in close proximity to the seat of civic government, and Thausing drowned himself in the Elbe. Clearly change was in the air.

In the year following Thausing's suicide, Franz Wickhoff took over the directorship of the Albertina and also Thausing's academic chair, which he quickly emancipated from its administrative ties to the *Institut*, founding the *Kunsthistorisches Institut*. He did not, however, renounce his intellectual debt to the historical institute. Both Wickhoff and his colleague Riegl were "von Haus aus" inheritors of the Morelli and Sickel tradition. Riegl's synthesis, however, diverged sharply from that of Wickhoff. A curator of oriental carpets at the Österreichisches Museum, Riegl was to combine Morelli's

[19]Arthur Rosenauer, "Moriz Thausing und die Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte," *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, XXXVI (1983), 135-139.

[20]Max Dvořák, "Franz Wickoff," in *Biographisches Jahrbuch und Deutscher Nekrolog*, XIV (1909) (Berlin: Georg Reimer Verlag, 1912), p. 318.

[21]Margaret Rose Olin, "Alois Riegl and the Crisis of Representation in Art Theory, 1880-1905" (doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1982), p. 88.

method with Schnaase's teleological drive. In his early work, Riegl traced the development of the design in its self-propelling progress toward purely artistic goals. However, like his contemporary, Heinrich Wölfflin, the Swiss art historian, the later Riegl believed that certain communal visual possibilities circumscribed the representational syntax of each epoch; appreciation, itself, was historical.

Wickhoff, in contrast, developed a schema for studying the history of art by casting it as "Problemgeschichte." For Wickhoff, the setting and solving of artistic problems created the dynamics for stylistic change in art. These problems, however, were not immanent in the design itself as they were for Riegl or posed by previous unsatisfactory solutions, as they were for Schnaase. For Wickhoff, heavily influenced by the archaeologist Alexander Conze, they were genetic, socio-psychological dilemmas of representation which formed traditions and styles by being worked out in the same way. Harboring an "almost fanatical opposition to purely formal investigation,"[22] Wickhoff preferred to study schools rather than motifs, religious and literary influences on art rather than design dynamics. By and large, Wickhoff abandoned the notion of artistic progress; he applauded the anti-naturalistic art of his day, seeing it as a grand challenge to the positivism of the last half-century as well as a sort of late Roman *ricorso*.[23]

Wickhoff's vigorous defense of Gustav Klimt's *Medicine* against charges that the painting was ugly and decadent reflected a rejection of classical and Renaissance-based aesthetics similar to that articulated in his *Wiener Genesis* of 1895. Co-authored by Wilhelm von Härtel, who was later appointed Minister of Education and Religion by Ernst von Koerber, *Wiener Genesis* paralleled Riegl's *Spätrömische Kunstindustrie* (1901) and Wölfflin's *Renaissance und Barok* (1888). Wickhoff and Härtel, like Riegl and Wölfflin, sought to rehabilitate the late Roman and the baroque by eschewing Renaissance and classical ideals. Style was now bound to the attitudes of its age, thus a matter for historical investigation, not amateur appraisal. The achievement of these men was clearly, as Dvořák would later note, "the victory of the psychological historical conception of art over absolute aesthetics."[24] Yet it was also the affirmation of Austrian eclectic culture against the Quattrocento and Hellenic aesthetic ideals of Italy and Prussia and, what was perhaps most critical, it was the triumph of those educated to discern stylistic subtleties in a specific way.

[22]Julius von Schlosser, "Die Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte," *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung*, suppl. vol. XIII, no. 2 (Innsbruck: Universitätsverlag Wagner, 1934), p. 178.

[23]*Ibid.*, p. 177.

[24]Dvořák quoted in Carl E. Schorske, *Fin de Siècle Vienna* (New York: Vintage Books, 1981), p. 235.

Wickhoff was also an exceptionally energetic lecturer and organizer. As noted earlier, he became the director of the Albertina at Thausing's death; soon thereafter, he became an editor of the *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* (*MIÖG*). In 1904, he established the *Kunsthistorische Anzeigen* as a supplementary section of *MIÖG*; here he and his protégé Dvořák attacked "chatterboxes and dilettantes," dogmatic connoisseurs and pedantic antiquarians.[25] Wickhoff's dedication to building his discipline as a bureaucratically streamlined and scientifically self-contained unit and his championing of Klimt, together, fit an age in which the Austrian government was becoming more and more the patron and proprietor of the art world. As the monarchy exchanged the ideal of a *Bürgerministerium* in the late 1870s for a *Beamtenministerium* in the late 1890s, Wickhoff gradually replaced Morelli as the exemplar of connoisseurship. The consolidation of his position, however, would await Dvořák.

As Paul Kristeller indicated long ago, it was only with the late eighteenth-century publication and popularization of the *Encyclopédie* that the five-member system of the fine arts crystallized in its modern form. Thereafter, for the first time, the subject of the scholar's study would be not the musical arts, but music as *an* art, with singular qualities and a unique, unitary life history.[26] This development coincided with the contagion of what another commentator has termed the "fascination of the inexplicable" among music theoreticians—"not the inexplicable in the music of the spheres or the First Cause, or Divine Creation, but the inexplicable as the *undated*—the unknown in man's history on earth, in the dim, unrecorded past."[27] The nineteenth century would not shake this thrall of the undated but would, indeed, seek to fill up every niche in a Great Chain of musical evolution.

As in art scholarship, historical writing was slow in arriving; in music studies the biographical style prevailed down to the 1840s. Here vignettes organized around the lives of great men, as in the influential work of Raphael Georg Kiesewetter, were strung together to form a chronology. Kiesewetter, an original member of Vienna's *Gesellschaft für Musikfreunde*, was one of the first historians to make consistent use of archival sources and also to put his findings into practice in directing a series of *historische Hauskonzerte*. Kiesewetter also saw in the study of the history of music an opportunity to pay tribute to an autonomous realm of human accomplishment and to indicate a genealogy of genius unconfined by national borders. "Music," he

[25]Dvořák, "Franz Wickhoff," p. 320.

[26]Paul O. Kristeller, "The Modern System of the Arts: A Study in the History of Aesthetics," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, XII (October 1951), 496-527, and XIII (January 1952), 23; see also Allen, *Philosophers of Music History*, p. 228 ff.

[27]Allen, *Philosophers of Music History*, p. 184.

wrote, "has no connection with the political divisions of kingdoms."[28] Like Schnaase, Kiesewetter conceived of artistic production as the constitution of culture as a reflection of the *Zeitgeist*; it was the task of the music scholar to make this history available both for practical use by performers and for private refinement of aesthetic and even moral judgment.

Yet those who conceived of music history as teacher of technique and those who argued its value as instructor of taste or temperament often disagreed, particularly when it came to education, for educational strategies set the social status of the *Tonkünstler* in addition to recommending the proper subject matter and style of music. In 1841-1842, for example, a controversy involving Adolf Brendel Marx, a Young Hegelian, and Gottfried Wilhelm Fink, a teacher of composition, centered on the instruction of composers and demonstrated the inseparability of musical concerns, aesthetic norms, and pedagogical principles. While Marx argued for total *Erziehung*, Fink insisted upon technical training as *Fachleute*. For Marx, the composer was a tone-poet-cum-philosopher; for Fink he was a craftsman. Marx treated studies of composition and of music of the past as propadeutics toward the creation of a cultural philosophy for the present; the pressing question for him was "was zu tun ist."[29] Fink, in contrast, advocated precise and detailed archival research, distrusting the interference of idealist philosophy in what seemed to him a skilled trade. While Marx's aesthetic appreciation of musical works was based on the notion that music does and must refer to things outside itself, Fink took the opposite view. In a piece decrying Marx's organic and political notion of instruction in composition as a dangerous reduction and leveling of many different lessons into a single, didactic tirade, he described Marx's principle of *Volkserziehungsbestrebungen* as an attempt "to kill the cherubs who stand before Paradise" and refused "to see or to make music a public nuisance."[30]

At the same time, the debate over what *could* be introduced into compositional technique and what *should* be introduced was occurring on another level—that of philosophical aesthetics. The significance of this debate lies in the conflation of arguments concerning possibility and advisability by both formalists and anti-formalists in the service of particular models of the ideal work of art. Paradigmatic of the formalist position, Eduard Hanslick's *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen* (1854) looked for an autonomous set of laws for the scientific determination of musical beauty. Hanslick contended both that

[28]Kiesewetter quoted in *ibid.*, p. 87.

[29]Marx quoted in Bernard Meier, "Zur Musikhistoriographie des 19. Jahrhunderts," in Walter Wiora, ed., *Die Ausbreitung des Historismus über die Musik* (Regensburg: Gustav Bosse Verlag, 1969), p. 187.

[30]Fink quoted in Kurt-Erich Eicke, "Das Problem des Historismus im Streit zwischen Marx und Fink," in Wiora, ed., *Die Ausbreitung*, p. 228.

music could not and that it ought not to express anything but musical ideas. In complete agreement with arch-Herbartian Robert Zimmermann, Hanslick protested "the intrusion of feelings upon the province of *science*,"[31] and turned his attention to objective formal analysis. "In music," he wrote, "there is both meaning and logical sequence, but in a *musical* sense; it is a language that we speak and understand, but which we are unable to *translate*."[32] Invoking Herbart against a list of twenty-two opponents (including Förkel and Richard Wagner), Hanslick insisted that the true nature of music, and thus its beauty, could not possibly lie in experience, individual or social.

It would take very little imagination to coax a socio-political reading out of Hanslick's book. As a polemic against Richard Wagner's "Kunst und Revolution" and "Das Kunstwerk der Zukunft," *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen* constantly set up formal boundaries where Wagner advocated breaking them down; where Wagner called for a revolutionary return to the natural, organic unity of poetry, tone, and dance, for his conservative antagonist, the blending of genres simply created *un*natural products. Devoted to the music of Haydn and Mozart, Hanslick identified the collapse of Viennese classical forms with the collapse of music itself. Equating music-drama and artificially imposed, purposeless parliamentary strife, Hanslick opposed modern politics as he did modern music—as a devoted servant of the monarchy and a gleeful participant in the Viennese culture of *feuilletons* and operettas. In allowing drama to infiltrate musical performance and German seriousness to trespass upon Austrian lightheartedness, Wagner's *Zukunftsmusik*, Hanslick believed, foreshadowed cultural as well as musical disaster. What was progress for Wagner was for Hanslick, as for Fink, transgression. The very compositions Wagner considered starting points (Beethoven's Ninth and *Missa Solemnis*), in fact, Hanslick described as "colossal Pillars of Hercules at the gates of modern music, saying 'No farther!'"[33]

It would hardly do, however, to see Hanslick simply as a reactionary. He did, occasionally, admit of Wagner's great musical talents. In this he was certainly more gracious than Wagner, who ceaselessly caricatured Hanslick as a pedantic, retrograde Jew. Hanslick's forte, in fact, was neither aesthetic theory nor music history, but music criticism. Although appointed to a university chair in 1861 as Professor of Aesthetics and History of Music, Hanslick was noted for *feuilletons*, not for archival research. His *Neue Freie Presse* pieces far outclassed the *Vormärz* style of music journalism, which

[31]Eduard Hanslick, *The Beautiful in Music*, Gustav Cohen, trans. (New York: Da Capo Press, 1974), p. 71.

[32]*Ibid.*, p. 11.

[33]Eduard Hanslick, *Music Criticisms 1846-99*, Henry Pleasants, trans. (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1950), p. 13.

consisted primarily of the gushings of officials and idle aristocrats trying their hands at criticism. In combining a light, readable style with the more critical tradition of music scholarship developed in Robert Schumann's *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* (Leipzig, from 1834), Hanslick, claimed Max Graf, became the model for a half-century of music critics.[34]

Hanslick was perhaps the first to make full use of the new opportunities engendered by the emancipation of music from court society. As connoisseurship in art became a paying profession only with the improvement of photographic techniques and the opening of grand-scale museums to the public, so music criticism became gainful employment only as a result of the expansion of the daily press and the formation of musical societies; the latter sponsored and conducted concerts, the former reviewed and advertised them. Both of these activities were circumscribed in the *Vormärz* era. Though the largest society, the *Gesellschaft für Musikfreunde*, was founded in 1812, it did not engage professional conductors for its orchestra until after 1848. By 1859, however, the society had established a conservatory, an archive, and a music library and had organized its own semi-professional *Singverein* and *Orchesterverein*.[35] The *Gesellschaft* became a powerful force in Viennese musical life, both in the preparation of performers and teachers for careers in music and in the development of a canon of classical works. Growing up in an age when the patronage of court society was on the decline and public music institutions had not yet risen to take its place, the *Gesellschaft* acted, on the one hand, as support-system for new research and fresh talent and, on the other hand, as a powerful arbiter of taste.

Describing his days as a Viennese music critic at the end of the century, Max Graf wrote: "We are living on battlefields of music."[36] The metaphor is apt; by the late 1880s, the music critique had reached its most vitriolic, with Hanslick describing Bruckner's music as "traumverwirrte Katzenjammerstil."[37] Yet, by this time, other models of music description were drawing attention. In 1856 A. W. Ambros had undertaken a Lessing-like definition of *Die Grenzen der Musik und Poesie*. This work and Ambros' subsequent, multi-volume *Geschichte der Musik* (1860-1868) pursued a course approximately halfway between Hanslick's formalism and the aesthetics of expression favored by the Wagnerians. In contrast to the Herbartians and the

[34]Max Graf, *Composer and Critic* (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1946), p. 252.

[35]Karl Geiringer, "The Friends of Music in Vienna," in *The Musical Quarterly*, XXIV, no. 3 (July 1938), 244-245.

[36]Graf, *Composer and Critic*, p. 27.

[37]Hanslick quoted in Norbert Tschulik, "Musikkritik in Österreich," in *Geschichte der österreichischen Musikkritik in Beispielen*, Manfred Wagner, ed. (Tutzing: Hans Schneider Verlag, 1979), p. 10.

proponents of *Zukunftsmusik*, Ambros sought to avoid aesthetic polemics. Including analogies with the visual arts, ethnographic material, and historical overviews, Ambros made formal structural analysis the point of departure for his study of music as "eine sittliche und sittigende Macht."[38]

Ambros' cultural focus, as Guido Adler described it, was hardly the only treatment of music history available to late nineteenth-century scholars. The 1870s and 1880s, Adler reported, saw a proliferation of styles of historical writing, from the philological concerns of Friedrich Chrysander to the biographical method of Phillip Spitta, from the lexicography of Hugo Riemann to the ethnography of Ambros.[39] What was common to all of these plans was the attempt to consider music from a standpoint disabused of subjective judgments based on taste or politics. The battlefields of *feuilleton* criticism, as well as the bog of philosophical aesthetics, were disdained by these writers in favor of historical treatment of schools and proto-stylistic analysis, which also derived its *Stilgesetze* or *Stilnormen* (as Adler would later refer to them; in 1885 he called them *Kunstgesetze*) from careful historical comparisons. Music appreciation could, perhaps, be salvaged from the ill-repute which had fallen on the *feuilleton* and the antinomies argued against absolute aesthetics by making it historical.

It is possible that the controversy over a Czech manuscript, a generational, political and professional quarrel over the legitimacy of an important document, played a part in Dvořák's decision in the late 1880s to forsake Czech history in Prague for art history in Vienna.[40] He did not, however, abandon his Prague dissertation, but recast his work in German and published it in abbreviated form several years later in the *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*. "Die Fälschungen des Reichskanzlers Kaspar Schlick" employed the Sickel-Morelli method of discerning "hands" to prove the forgery of an important fifteenth-century document; in addition, Dvořák defended the use of forged documents as worthy sources for historical inquiry. "Forgeries," he contended, "often throw a sharper light on the epoch of their origin and on their authors than do authentic documents."[41] For Dvořák, Schlick's documents were exemplary in spite of and even owing to their status as forgeries; in a paradoxical turn, material which appeared to be completely invalid for constructing a descriptive account of the period suddenly had become more illuminating, historically, than documents considered authentic.

[38]Ambros quoted in Tschulik, p. 15.

[39]Guido Adler, "Style Criticism," in *The Musical Quarterly*, XX, no. 2 (April 1934), 172.

[40]For a short account of this controversy, see Roman Szporluk, *The Political Thought of Thomas C. Maszryk* (New York: Columbia University Pess, 1981), p. 89 ff.

[41]Max Dvořák, "Die Fälschungen des Reichkanzlers Kaspar Schlick," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, XXII (1901), 54.

Here a parallel with the contemporaneous work of Wickhoff and Riegl may be suggested. Riegl's boredom with perfect artistic solutions, Wickhoff's vehement attacks on "sacrosanct act-ideals and style concepts,"[42] and Dvořák's defense of the illegitimate as a legitimate object of inquiry reveal not only their horror of dogmatic aesthetic (or moral) judgments but also their separation of the notion of what is significant about an object of inquiry from current assessments of its beauty or validity. Not the demonstration of timeless truth or beauty but the delineation of developments was the scholar's task; "the best art historian," Dvořák repeated after Riegl, "is one who himself has no taste, for in art history it is a matter of finding objective criteria for [assessing] historical development."[43] In an early article in the *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, Dvořák noted the new achievement in science as well as in art history that facts were no longer to be described as isolated appearances but as members in a particular continuum of facticity.[44] A heuristic morphology of stylistic transformations, he proposed, could take the place of causal explanations and, at the same time, liberate the significance of artifacts from dogmatic aesthetic judgments and the dictates of fashion.

Already in his essays of 1903, "Das Rätsel der Brüder van Eyck" and "Les Aliscans," it is possible to find Dvořák reciting what will become, for him, canonical: Perceived breaks in the continuum running from antiquity to the present day are simply the product of inaccessible materials or insufficient scholarship. In "Les Aliscans," a study of an early Christian burial ground, Dvořák cancelled the apparent caesura between the end of antique and beginning of modern sculpture by showing the Janus-quality of nascent sepulchral statuary. He also insisted, here, on the equivalence in value of all styles; the Gothic-monumental stood between the antique and the Renaissance not as poor relation but as equal expression of the particular aesthetic ideas of its age and of historically unique solutions to specific formal problems.[45] Although the latter remained his primary concern at least down to 1914, still Dvořák, like Wickhoff, despised pure formalism, seeking to show historical variations in *Kunstzweck* as well as in *Kunstform*. What Dvořák's student Dagobert Frey would describe as his mentor's drive toward "Aufhebung jeder Zäsur" included lacunae in these ideas (still purely artistic) as well as missing links in the great chain of form-evolution.[46]

[42]See Olin, *Alois Riegl and Crisis*, p. 280, and see Dvořák on Wickhoff in his *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kunstgeschichte* (Munich: R. Piper & Co., 1929), p. 309.

[43]Dvořák quoted in Max Wegner, *Altertumskunde* (Munich: Verlag Karl Alber, 1951), p. 281.

[44]Max Dvořák, "Das Rätsel der Kunst der Brüder van Eyck," *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen*, XXIV (1903), 166.

[45]Max Dvořák, "Les Aliscans," in his *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, p. 18.

[46]Dagobert Frey, "Max Dvořáks Stellung in der Kunstgeschichte," in *Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, I (1922), 8; see also Dvořák, "Ernst Cohn-Wiener. Die Entwicklungsgeschichte der Stile in der bildenden Kunst," *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen*, VII, no. 2 (1910), 31-34.

The stylistic change ushered in by Jan van Eyck, wrote the Czech Catholic, resulted from the overcoming of medieval conventions in the apperception of truthfulness to nature as well as in conventions governing in the form of the representation itself. Van Eyck himself was merely the beneficiary, not the instigator, of stylistic change; as Dvořák argued elsewhere, to attribute the invention of naturalsim to a particular painter was tantamount to crediting a specific scholar with the invention of thinking.[47] Instead, Dvořák maintained that continuous metamorphosis in the conventions of realistic representation, in combination with ur-cultural proclivities, shaped the causal nexus from which invention arose. "It was new goals and new norms of painterly truth," he contended, "which made it possible for Jan to represent men of his society thus. . . ."[48] In fact, though Dvořák lauded van Eyck, he did not even credit the painter with the creation of these "new goals and new norms." Genius, for Dvořák, was a false category.

The true origins of van Eyck's style, he wrote, lay in the transformation of the heritage of classical antiquity in the hands of emergent central European *Kulturvölker*. Thus 'Gothic' naturalism, he contended, was to be understood as a historical phenomenon which possessed its own evolutionary dynamism:

> The new naturalism is neither something objective nor something transcendental; nor is it exceptional but, like all other human things, a historical product, the first of a new historical evolution which began with the sculptures of great Gothic cathedrals and up to the present day has not been interrupted. . . . Without Gothic sculpture and painting, Masaccio, Donatello and the Renaissance . . . and all of modern art would not have been possible.[49]

Tracing the point of classical-central European admixture back to fourteenth-century Avignon, where French, Italian, and northern artists worked together on the papal palace, Dvořák overturned the "classical prejudice" that the Italian Quattrocento invented modern civilization; humanistic culture, he claimed, took shape under Charles V as well as under Lorenzo ("the parvenu") de' Medici.[50]

This was an attack on cultural history after the manner of Jakob Burckhardt, whose *Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* had claimed for the Quattrocento "the discovery of man and the world." Dvořák returned to

[47]Max Dvořák, review of "A. Venturi, *Storia dell'arte Italiana*," in *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen*, II, no. 3 (1905), 89.

[48]Dvořák, "Rätsel," p. 209.

[49]Dvořák, "Rätsel," pp. 316-317.

[50]*Ibid*., pp. 295-297; 262. For a more extensive treatment of turn-of-the-century revisions of the Renaissance, see Walter K. Ferguson, *The Renaissance in Historical Thought* (New York: AMS Press, repr., 1981).

Burckhardt's claim time and again in the essay, stressing on the contrary the protracted struggle of tradition and individual experience, convention and subjective vision. "There are anomalies in historical writing," he asserted, "that are difficult to understand. To these belong the cult and the overestimation of the Renaissance as an epoch which splits the history of human civilization in two halves."[51] Vasari and the "great men" biographical form of art history were to blame for this overestimation, Dvořák asserted; Vasari's celebratory myths had led astray generations of art historians, who, "instead of troubling to establish for themselves the actual findings, have ever and anew composed around the old *Künstlerroman*."[52] Not for lack of material but for the sake of preserving Renaissance heroes has the Gothic age had no Vasari; otherwise it would have long ago been noticed that Gothic naturalism had produced geniuses on the order of Raphael, Bellini, and Leonardo one hundred years earlier.[53] Dvořák finished the essay with a didactic coda, asking for a reevaluation of this overweening attachment to Vasari and his Renaissance aesthetic. Undoubtedly, this was the Wickhoff-Riegl battle strategy transposed for the sancrosanct ideal of the Quattrocento.

Dvořák's emphasis on the eradication of apparent lacunae in the representational record, reported his student Frey, derived at least in part from his desire to mobilize hitherto inaccessible collections and to establish a German language *Verein für Kunstwissenschaft*.[54] By the time of "Das Rätsel," Dvořák, still a *Privatdozent* protégé of Riegl and Wickhoff, was already collaborating with his mentors on numerous projects to expand, organize, and catalog Austria's art holdings and to streamline, professionalize, and publicize the discipline. Wickhoff's *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen*, at first almost exclusively composed of book reviews by Wickhoff and Dvořák, presented the viewpoint of the Viennese *Kunsthistorisches Institut* loudly and clearly, affording the *Institut* a means to expose the pretentions of untutored amateurs and other "enemies of German science, her spirit and her goals."[55] Dvořák reviewed organization of exhibitions, curatorial practice, and composition of catalogs as well as monographs; here, too, he was relentless in demanding complete historical coverage and objective, *stilgeschichtlich* treatment.

At Riegl's death in 1905, Dvořák took over the directorship of the *Zentralkommission für Erhaltung der Bau- und Kunstdenkmäler*[56] and with

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 262.

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 186.

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 293.

[54] Frey, "Max Dvořáks Stellung," p. 4.

[55] Max Dvořák, "Nachwort," *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen*, VIII, nos. 1/2 (1911), 128.

[56] On Riegl's role and his theory of *Denkmalpflege*, see Margaret Olin, "The Cult of Monuments as a State Religion in late 19th Century Austria," *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, XXXVIII (1985), 177-198.

it the project of cataloging Austria's art collections. Volumes of *Österreichische Kunsttopographie* began to appear in 1907, bearing the impress of Dvořák's editorship. In his introduction to the first volume, Dvořák made clear his intention to present neither a descriptive lexicon of monuments nor a string of historical digressions of interest only to the antiquarian, but instead to place pieces in relation to the intellectual culture of their time and to determine their location in the course of artistic development. In this way, Dvořák hoped, public interest and scientific investigation might be awakened and the current dilapidation and obscurity of Austrian cultural monuments might be redressed. Dvořák looked enviously toward Italy, where, owing largely to new impetus given to inventory by the introduction of photography, grand new projects of documentation were being undertaken, ritualizing her invented "artistic predestination."[57] To display the "soziales Gefühlsleben" from which works of art stem and to demonstrate the historical continuity of artistic monuments, Dvořák reasoned, was to contribute to the love of one's homeland. Monuments, he wrote, serve as "documents of past cultural solidarity, as a genealogy of the present which replaces the biographical family tree."[58] The inventory, for Dvořák, was not only a scientific but also a patriotic duty.

Wickhoff's early death in 1909, too, brought Dvořák new tasks. Appointed, finally, an *außerordentlicher* professor in 1905, Dvořák had tirelessly borne the burden of directing dissertations, doing committee-work, and attending conferences. When the vote was taken for a successor to Wickhoff's chair, however, another protégé of the *Institut*, Julius von Schlosser, was elected. When he declined the nomination, Dvořák was at last selected, but not without opposition, which Schlosser, writing in 1934, no doubt correctly ascribed to anti-Czech sentiment.[59] This would not have been, by any means, Dvořák's first encounter with nationalistic prejudice at the *Institut*. Not only was he hissed while he lectured, but, as one commentator remembered, German nationalists frequently disrupted Wickhoff's lectures, serenading the student body with "Wacht am Rhein" in protest of Dvořák's assistantship.[60]

Nationalist bias, however, hardly cooled Dvořák's patriotism or his professional pride. In addition to Wickhoff's chairs, Dvořák also took over Wickhoff's editorship of *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* and *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen*, and soon thereafter established the *Kunstgeschichtliches Jahrbuch der Zentralkommission* as an auxiliary organ of *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen*. Over the

[57]Max Dvořák, "Einleitung," *Österreichische Kunsttopographie*, I (1907), xiv.

[58]*Ibid.*, p. xviii.

[59]Schlosser, "Die Wiener Schule," p. 194.

[60]Johnston, *The Austrian Mind*, p. 71

next several years, Dvořák wrote scores of book reviews and short pieces, generally on the subject of techniques of restoration and on the state of Austrian art collections, ever mindful of the scientific mission bestowed on him by his mentors. His attacks on adversaries within the discipline and intruders from without can scarcely be said to have flagged with the passing of his beloved tutor. Even in his *Nekrolog* on Wickhoff, Dvořák raged against the invasion of the discipline by unscientific amateurs. "The wave of cultural decline," he stormed, "which, in the nineteenth century as in all ages, follows the emancipation of the theretofore cultureless social strata [and] drags the communal understanding of art down to a minimum, has also been felt in art history, in which dilettantes and newspaper journalists have taken the lead and barred the way to all scientific progress."[61]

A regular feature of Dvořák's defense of the scientific legitimacy of the discipline after the deaths of Riegl and Wickhoff was his insistence on the independence of art history from cultural history through its objective investigation of style. "The great progress of art history," he announced, "consists precisely in that it . . . has elevated style-historical inquiry to the most important source of art-historical criticism and explanation."[62] Dvořák warned Aby Warburg, Erwin Panofsky, and others whom he believed to be trespassing on alien interpretive territory that art history had only recently gained its present status as a respectable *Wissenschaft* by virtue of enunciating its own legitimate method; it was hardly prudent to abandon it so soon. At a 1913 conference of art historians he upbraided his renegade colleagues for straying into unscientific fields like philosophy and psychology and demanded that art history "return to those duties which in all scientific activity must be primary: to the duty of methodical, systematic investigation of the investigable facts."[63] The need for secure foundations, for Dvořák, required return to style-historical delineation of the evolution of formal representations; art-historical inquiry still demanded an eye carefully schooled in paleography, sketches (the Albertina tradition), and the eccentricities of the master's hand.

Yet Dvořák was on the brink of major methodological change. In the catalog of the 1915-1916 winter semester he announced to a prospective audience, which included Thomas Masaryk, Max Graf, Karl Mannheim, Erwin Panofsky, and Georg Lukács, his presentation of a new lecture course: "Idealism and Realism in the Art of the Modern Age." His course-description read: "New criteria bring new problems with them, and there can be no doubt

[61]Dvořák, "Franz Wickhoff," p. 326.

[62]Dvořák quoted in William S. Heckscher, "The Genesis of Iconology," in *Stil und Überlieferung in der Kunst des Abendlandes*, III (1964), 247.

[63]*Ibid.*, p. 247.

that in art history a new orientation has come to pass which offers new viewpoints for inquiry."[64] Dvořák alluded not only to the war but also to *Geisteswissenschaftstheorie* and its concomitant new perspectives on what constituted scientific inquiry. In a purely methodological piece published in 1914, Dvořák had already sought to integrate Dilthey's emphasis on lived experience into the science of analyzing style; while he stressed style-historical objectivity based on facts and not on aesthetic prejudices or isolated instances, Dvořák also allowed "history in the highest sense, in which research must keep company with the divinatory work of the imagination."[65] By the time *Idealismus und Naturalismus in der gotischen Skulptur und Malerei* went to the publisher in 1917, Dvořák's passage from formalism to *Weltanschauungstheorie* was complete. If in 1913 he had warned Aby Warburg against trespassing on cultural history's territory and had called for "investigation of the investigable facts," he was now prepared to see the development of medieval art as "the conflict of universals."[66] Transformations of style were not to be traced to any sort of immanent representational drive; these were no longer motivated by changes occurring only in the realm of art. What was understood by the term "art" and what was sought in and demanded of artistic endeavor, Dvořák explained, "is at all times a temporally and culturally defined and variable result of the general evolution of mankind. . . . Only on the basis of a clear knowledge of underlying principles in various times and places . . . can the way to an historical understanding of the artistic phenomena of by-gone periods be found."[67] Style was now to be understood not as the means by which the artist solved formal problems of representation but as the expression of a world view which conditioned the positing of these dilemmas. In this way, the dogmatisms that defined successful art on the Renaissance and classical models of realistic proportion and dimension were to fall to an inspection of the *raison d'être* of non-naturalistic art—not as inability but as ulterior motive.

For Dvořák, medieval art existed for the purpose of moral edification, not objective reproduction; Gothic figural representations wished to *surpass* natural experience and replace this with the experience of God. Thus its hieroglyphics strained to represent something "truer than nature," to illumi-

[64]Dvořák quoted in Otto Benesch, "Max Dvořák," in *Neue Österreichische Biographie: Grosse Österreicher*, X (Vienna: Amalthea Verlag, 1957), 194.

[65]Max Dvořák, "Über die dringendsten methodischen Erfordernisse der Erziehung zur kunstgeschichtlichen Forschung," reprinted in *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, XXVII (1974), 19.

[66]Dvořák quoted in Michael Ann Holly, *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984), p. 104; Dvořák, *Idealism and Naturalism in Gothic Art*, Randolph J. Klawiter, trans. (Notre Dame, Ind.: Notre Dame University Press, 1967), p. 105.

[67]Dvořák, *Idealism and Naturalism*, p. 123.

nate a relationship outside natural causality.[68] What appeared to be a decline in man's rational control of matter actually derived from a new orientation of the imagination in which art sought to express abstract religious ideas instead of sense-perceptions. Other classical pursuits, Dvořák contended, also declined not by being overrun by barbarians but by being abandoned by the best minds, which now turned their attention elsewhere. "The positive sciences, national literatures, naturalistic art—all of these fell into decay because the great thinkers were now faced with a totally new question as to the ultimate meaning of existence, a question which far surpassed their former humanistic endeavors. . . ."[69] The key to the entire medieval *Weltanschauung* and world order, for Dvořák, lay in the relationship between transcendental ideas and the world as such, in the Church's struggle against classical sensualism. The puzzle of Gothic art was to be solved with this cipher.

In spiritual development, as well, there were to be no *Zäsuren*; Gothic art and the Gothic *Weltanschauung* were part and parcel of the continuum between classical paganism and modern expressionism. Medieval spiritual demands, based on an inner dialectic of observation and conviction, opened "new possibilities of experiences," both empirical and intellectual; its final signature read: "I cannot escape the spirits whom I have summoned."[70]

Neither, it seems, could Dvořák. The steps taken down the road of *Weltanschauungstheorie* had taken him far from his Morellian formalism. In the preface to *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte* (written 1915-1921; compiled 1924), Dvořák proclaimed: "Art consists not only in the solution of problems and the development of formal capabilities; it is also always and in the first place an expression of the controlling ideas of mankind—its history, no less than religion, philosophy, or poetry a part of the total history of ideas."[71] In the series of essays which make up the volume, Dvořák argued this contention for the "pictorial theosophy" of catacomb painting as well as the "frustrated hedonism" of the era of science and technology. The maturing of landscape-painting in the sixteenth century was viewed as a reflection of the shattering of Renaissance anthropomorphism. Dürer's *Apocalypse* embodied a new relationship of art to the problems of human existence, Dvořák argued; in his break with pure empirical observation and portrayal, Dürer was emblematic of the changing orientation of subjective experience and naturalism later expressed by Martin Luther. Brueghel's depiction of the *Volk* with cultural-historical realism paralleled his epoch's emancipation of

[68]*Ibid.*, pp. 33-36.

[69]*Ibid.*, p. 19.

[70]*Ibid.*, p. 109.

[71]Max Dvořák, *The History of Art as the History of Ideas*, John Hardy, trans. (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984), p. x.

the natural sciences from dogmatic restrictions and the baroque realism of Shakespeare, Cervantes, and Rabelais. In similar ways, all realms partook of the seventeenth-century liberation of experience from the confines of formal structures, both institutional and representational.[72]

For Dvořák, then, the continuous developmental chain was to be employed in a new way. Whereas the strongest links, previously, had formed a vertical lineage of formal inheritances, now the scholar was to concentrate on the horizontal linkage, the shared *Weltanschauung* of the artist and his epoch. Dvořák exhorted his colleagues to train their eyes to the discovery of this sort of continuity even as he had in earlier works entreated the experienced eye to find genealogies of detail. "A great artist never stands absolutely outside the spiritual and intellectual ferment of his time," Dvořák wrote, "and if the threads binding him to it are invisible to us, then it means we have failed to look deeply enough either into his art or into the age in which he lived."[73] Some years later, a grateful Otto Benesch explained his mentor's strict and pragmatic historical science as a strain of proto-iconology. "The sole foundation of this scientific method of approach," wrote Benesch, "is the view that the work of art is a statement and the literary evidence its meaningfully interpreted source."[74] The artistic representation was to serve as personal and social confessional. Just as for Panofsky the visual arts were to be comprehended by analogy, as discursive rationality, for Dvořák as well, the picture could speak not only its mind but also the mind of its time.[75] The task of translating, naturally, fell to the caste most conversant in stylistic discourse, the art-historical mandarinate.

As for Guido Adler, it is quite possible to take his sanitized autobiography *Wollen und Wirken* as testimony to his overall professional ethic. In the book Adler contended that his most solemn task, "the highest estimation of every work in the service of mankind, in art as well as in science,"[76] required absolute scientific neutrality and aesthetic impartiality. "I always observed at a certain distance," Adler wrote, "I saw, when I was writing, the artist or scholar standing on a pedestal before me."[77] This removed and reverential stance Adler contrasted with that of the "Schnellbiograph" and the "Tageskritiker," unable to give music its proper scientific treatment in their rush to publish. For the daily review, he explained, "I had an inner aversion; the objectivity of the scientist was incompatible with the unavoidable subjec-

[72]*Ibid.*, p. 95

[73]*Ibid.*, p. 71

[74]Otto Benesch, "From the Scholar's Workshop," in Eva Benesch, ed., *Otto Benesch: Collected Writings*, vol. I (London: Phaidon Press, 1970), p. xiii.

[75]Podro, *Critical Historians of Art*, p. xxvi.

[76]Guido Adler, *Wollen und Wirken* (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1935), p. 15.

[77]Engel, "Guido Adler in Retrospect," p. 397.

tivity of the daily journalist."[78] Adler's distaste for subjective criticism clearly sought escape from what Graf called "the battlefields of music," whose troops, Graf remembered, by the turn of the century, "had fled to the lonely island of personal feelings and isolated impressions."[79] For Adler, the historian's job of clarification and objective presentation required that he put distance between himself and the stranded victim of fleeting impressions. "The music historian," he wrote, "cannot allow himself to be dragged into the confusion of vacillating value judgments like the daily critic. . . . He is not permitted to make himself simply dependent on the opinions and aspirations of his age."[80] Rising above the flux of opinion, the scholar was to operate with a value-neutral, historical standard of music appraisal.

Adler argued that both sides of the Hanslick-Wagner debate over the beautiful in music failed to recognize that ideals changed over time and space. Beauty was a relative category and therefore required historical, not philosophical, treatment. Absolute aesthetics, like polemics in the *feuilleton*, were to be banished from music history. An eighteenth-century anachronism, he wrote, the "Spielball ästhetisierender Raisonnements" had distracted nineteenth-century theoreticians from the true task of describing music's developmental path, its circumstances of origination, and its relationship to its carriers. Perhaps aesthetics could proceed "from alchemy to a more precise science, a chemistry of psychical phenomena and movements," but Adler doubted it.[81] "The precise analyst," he contended, would stick to the determination of the origins and attributes of musical styles and avoid aesthetic judgments all together "in order not to lose himself in a garden of errors and not to forsake the path that leads to the knowledge of [musical] genetics."[82]

Further attention is required for Adler's "genetics," in which the musical composition is thought to resemble an organism, and its history is conceived as genealogical filiation. It is first necessary, however, to undertake a discussion of Adler's advocation of professional distance and aesthetic impartiality against the background of his own career, for Adler was actually quite close to a number of prominent musicians and critics of his day, and, at times, not at all impartial. "Distance," for Adler, was the key to scientificness, and scientificness was the key to respectability. Once he abandoned the "battlefields" of criticism for professional scholarship, Adler pledged that his

[78]Adler, *Wollen und Wirken*, p. 124.

[79]Graf, *Composer and Critic*, p. 324.

[80]Guido Adler, *Methode der Musikgeschichte* (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1919), pp. 52-53.

[81]Adler, *Methode*, pp. 8-9.

[82]*Ibid.*, p. 122

work would serve the uncontroversial purpose of making the old accessible once more and that it would benefit all artists by uncovering and clarifying sources upon which they might draw. For Adler, the music historian was obliged to honor two deities, Music and Science; to do so required fervent professional commitment and complete personal neutrality.

In 1864 Adler left Iglau for the *Akademisches Gymnasium* in Vienna. Four years later, he entered the conservatory run by the *Gesellschaft für Musikfreunde*, where he studied with Anton Bruckner and Josef Hellmesberger. By 1874, however, Adler had decided that his talents were insufficient for creative composition. He left the conservatory with his *Künstlerdiplom* to study law (as had Kiesewetter, Ambros, and Hanslick before him). But Adler continued to participate in Viennese musical culture while attending the university. He was, in fact, a founding member of the *Wiener Akademischer Wagner Verein*, an organization which demanded and indeed eventually effectuated the performance of a wider variety of musical works in the capital city.[83] In 1878, Adler completed his degree and began the practice of law, which he was to abandon three months later. Returning to the conservatory, Adler elected the study of music history as, he wrote in retrospect, "a surrogate for the work of composition."[84]

Completing his *Doktorat* in 1880, he received for his dissertation ("Die historischen Grundklassen der christlich-abendländischen Musik bis 1600") the lauds of Hanslick and a *Privatdozent* position under the critic's direction at the University of Vienna. That an original member of the *Wagner Verein* could win Hanslick's favor is somewhat surprising; but then, too, this Wagnerite was at the time closely associated with the *Ambrosius Verein*, which performed at the imperial palace, and with Josef Böhm, the *Kapellmeister* of the imperial church. In the space of one year, Adler made the pilgrimage to Bayreuth to see the première of *Parsifal* and attended the first European-wide conference on early Christian choral music, in the dual capacity of reporter for *Das Vaterland* and as a governmental emissary.[85] By this time, Adler had begun to turn his thoughts to reform. Overhaul of the conservatory was first on his agenda; when this project ran aground, he adroitly shelved his plan and threw his energy into a campaign for the refiguration of university musical studies based on professional integrity and scientific rigor. In the midst of *feuilleton* strife and aesthetic polemics, Adler's superior diplomatic skill and ability to adjust his sights according to available opportunities allowed him

[83]William Weber, "Wagner, Wagnerism and Musical Idealism," in David C. Large and William Weber, eds., *Wagnerism in European Culture and Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984), p. 67.

[84]Adler, *Wollen und Wirken*, p. 9.

[85]*Ibid.*, p. 23.

acquaintances without allegiances; among the essential elements of his success were dedication, ingenuity, and organizational ability—but also finesse.

By the late 1880s Adler had abandoned the *Wagner Verein*. Insisting that its original purpose, the valorizing of Wagner's music, had been fulfilled, Adler protested the expansion of the function of the *Verein* from student club to professional pressure group. If, as one commentator notes, Adler's abdication was necessary for the furtherance of his career,[86] the historian had already begun to search for new ways to open minds to music, both in terms of methodological tactics and social praxis. In 1885, he at last published the first issue of the journal he had been planning for two years: *Vierteljahrsschrift für Musikwissenschaft* (*VfM*). His co-editors were the top German music scholars Phillip Spitta and Friedrich Chrysander, and among the *Mitarbeiter* he listed Ernst Mach, Hermann Kretzschmer, Max Planck, and Alexius Meinong. The journal, they insisted, was to maintain an "überparteilich" stance; the goal of the undertaking, as described in the preface, was "to create a vigorous organ, whose only purpose must be to serve science."[87]

The methodology recommended by Adler in his introductory essay represented an attempt to combine the paleographic, philological, pedagogical, and cultural-historical pursuits of his contemporaries in a common *Wissensgebiet*. Adler diagrammed together the two main components of *Musikwissenschaft*, the historical and the systematic modes of inquiry, arraying underneath these a huge table of *Hilfswissenschaften*. The high mission Adler set out for the musicologist entailed the determination of the specific *Kunstgesetze* of each epoch; through the use of all applicable areas of the chart, he was to contrast numerous examples, reveal their common traits, and isolate their variances before entering any description of a piece of music. Like Dvořák's art history without gaps, Adler's music history was modelled on the phylogenetic evolutionary chain; the duty of the scholar was elaboration of the organic connections of art works and classification of the individual according to structural type. The music scholar, Adler contended, on the model of the painstaking taxonomist, was to determine the *Kunstgattung* of his sample, its origin, age, and singular qualities only after a protracted survey of notation, rhythm, tonality, voice-writing, thematic organization, cadences, accidentals, harmony, poetic text, melodic line, and instrumentation.[88] Clearly the prerequisite training for this endeavor out-

[86]William A. Weber, "The Vienna Wagner Verein: Politics for Art's Sake" (master's thesis, University of Chicago, 1965), p. 33.

[87]Guido Adler, Phillip Spitta, Friedrich Chrysander, "Vorwort," *Vierteljahrsschrift für Musikwissenschaft*, I (1885), 1.

[88]Guido Adler, "Umfang," *Vierteljahrsschrift für Musikwissenschaft*, I (1885), pp. 6-7.

stripped the abilities of the amateur; the meticulous attention to the paleographic and notational idiosyncracies of the original score as well as the requirements for elucidation of the cultural context made his musical science the province of the elite eye as well as the well-tempered ear.

To enhance this high mission Adler undertook a grand project to publish, under the title *Monumenta historiae musices*, a series of musical works by forgotten composers. As originally conceived, the enterprise encompassed all of European music from the origins of polyphony to the present; publication was to be bureaucratically divided by nationality. In the name of scientific solidarity, Adler solicited the participation of Austrian, German, English, French, Italian, Spanish, and Hungarian governments and antiquarian societies. Apparently only the German government responded favorably, but preferred to pursue the project separately and in two factions, one Prussian and one Bavarian.[89] In 1892 Adler printed a preliminary edition and an introductory essay in *Vierteljahrsschrift für Musikwissenschaft* entitled "Die Kaiser Ferdinand III, Leopold I, Joseph I, and Karl VI als Tonsetzer und Förderer der Musik." At last the interest of the Austrian court was awakened. Following an audience with the music historian, Franz Joseph declared state support for the association, now under the name *Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich*.

The 1892 decree was intended to underscore the independent, scientific status of the organization; *Denkmäler der Tonkunst* was not an official publication but merely an officially subsidized one.[90] Publication began in 1893 but occurred only sporadically owing to inadequate funds, which Adler enviously compared to the mounting subsidy for the Prussian musical serial. Soon after the turn of the century, however, Adler's series found itself on firm footing. The *Denkmäler* survived even war and inflation as Adler found new subscribers in libraries and universities to replace vanished patronage from courts and nobility. Making good use of his connections, Adler arranged wartime production of the serial through a Czech paper factory whose president was a personal friend.[91] By 1918, Hermann Kretzschmar reported, *Denkmäler der Tonkunst* boasted forty-nine volumes—fifteen of church music, twenty-seven of secular music, seven of mixed content—covering Austrian music from Gregorian chant to the "Wunderbauten der Klassikerzeit."[92]

[89]Adler, *Wollen und Wirken*, pp. 11-12. The first Prussian publication is dated 1892, the Bavarian is dated 1900.

[90]Guido Adler, "Zur Vorgeschichte der Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich," *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft*, V (1918), 19.

[91]Adler, *Wollen und Wirken*, p. 70.

[92]Hermann Kretzschmar, "Die Denkäler der Tonkunst in Österreich," *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft*, V (1918), 22.

The task of cataloging and publishing monuments for Adler, as for Dvořák, appeared at once scientific and patriotic; his projects expressed both occupational and national pride. Adler's scattered introductions and editorial comments in the *Denkmäler* volumes often echo Dvořák's claim that things French and Italian had been overrated by posterity simply as a result of misunderstanding and of neglect of things Austrian and German. Of Austrian opera, for example, Adler wrote: "The chief reason that the classical works of our literature are so rarely performed is that we have not ascertained the means to be able to bring them closer to our comprehension."[93] Like Dvořák, too, Adler undertook a great number of organizational projects—conferences, concerts, exhibitions—demonstrating to the public the virtues of musical science and consolidating within the discipline a sense of common purpose. Adler gave up a half-year of lecturing in 1892 to direct the section on music history of Vienna's "Musik und Theateraustellung." In 1900, he was on hand to assist in the preparations for the Paris *Exposition internationale*, and the 1909 Haydn *Zentenarfeier*, organized under his aegis, served as a model for numerous exhibitions thereafter.

Adler's ability to press his opinions quietly in this period seems to have steadily increased. Quite probably the *curriculum vitae* he wrote for Gustav Mahler assisted the composer in obtaining the directorship of the Vienna Court Opera in 1897, and Adler is surely to be credited with securing the printing of several of Mahler's symphonies through the *Denkmäler* publishers Breitkopf und Härtel.[94] When Hanslick vacated his chair in Vienna in 1897, then, his ambitious assistant was the obvious choice. However, as in the case of Dvořák, it appears that his appointment did not proceed as smoothly as might have been expected. He began to lecture late in 1898. A year later, feeling overextended, he gave up editorship of *Vierteljahrsschrift für Musikwissenschaft*. In 1904, he at last published his first (and only) book-length application of his music-historical theory, entitled simply *Richard Wagner*.

The war over Wagner had ended, Adler's book announced, and his music the victor. Now the time had come for the composer to take his place in the developmental chain of occidental music which stretched from the Greeks to the present day. Wagner's achievement was as old as it was new, as conventional as it was transformational. On Wagner's creation of *Gesamtkunst-*

[93]Guido Adler, "Einleitung (Marc Antonio Cestri: 'Il Pomo di Oro')," in *Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich*, III, pt. 2 (1896), xxvi.

[94]Henry-Louis de la Grange, *Gustav Mahler*, vol. II: *L'Age d'or de Vienne, 1900-1907* (Paris: Fayard, 1973), p. 280; Edward R. Reilly, *Gustav Mahler und Guido Adler* (Vienna: Gustav Mahler Gesellschaft, 1978), pp. 1-4.

werke Adler commented: "This, too, is not only an artwork of the future, but it was also an artwork of the past."[95] Throughout the book, Adler insisted on this Janus-character of Wagner and his works; though a genius, Wagner was a historically bound genius. Like the Hegelian philosopher, he was unable to jump outside his time; he excelled not by opposing but by exemplifying his age. "Wagner would not have fulfilled his mission," Adler concluded, "if his works had not at the same time corresponded with the gradually awakening and budding intuitions (*Anschauungen*) of his age."[96]

Adler, in applying the methodology outlined in his first theoretical essay, treated Wagner's musical compositions as an unidentified species of organism to be charted onto an evolutionary tree of "Menschengeist." His book differed vastly from the two most significant current models of evaluation of Wagner—Friedrich Nietzsche's *Der Fall Wagner* (1888) and George Bernard Shaw's *The Perfect Wagnerite* (1898). Shaw and Nietzsche portrayed Wagner's music as the embodiment of a cause—for Shaw a pessimistic, socialist one, for Nietzsche (and for Max Nordau), a degenerate, egoistic one. For Adler, Wagner's works were to be understood from the standpoint of their heredity, their independence or dependence on previous paradigms. The investigation of the inner coherence of Wagner's creation, which Adler revealed as the *Hauptziel* of his book, entailed the comparative deduction of a hidden, historically conditioned architecture which explained, evaluated, and authenticated the works of Richard Wagner, more a style than a man. Where Dvořák studied the van Eyck brothers' triptych for the telltale detail, Adler inspected the score for the unmistakable Wagnerian impress. If Adler lauded the musical biography as the highest form of music scholarship, this was to be, in fact, the same sort of taxonomic exercise as the classification of unknowns. From the analysis of the quirks which betrayed the master's hand, Wagner's borrowings and reworkings could be assessed, and his place in the evolution of *Menschengeist* adduced.

Adler's idiosyncratic notion of biography quite certainly owes something to contemporary histories which took the collective (or *Volksseele*) as their starting point, treating the individual not as a separate entity but as a symbolic form. Hostile to individualistic thinking (which they often identified with Leopold von Ranke), several of these theorists conceived of history as morphological cultural transformation and saw the task of the historian in the apprehension of underlying social-psychological patterns. Thus Wilhelm Wundt, for example, criticized the Rankeans for their static conception of intellectual history, insisting that ideas were not entities but processes.[97] Karl

[95]Guido Adler, *Richard Wagner* (Munich: Drei Masken Verlag, 1925), p. 6.

[96]*Ibid.*, p. 262.

[97]Susan D. Schultz, "History as a Moral Force Against Individualism" (doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1985), p. 54.

Lamprecht, in particular, pressed for the downplaying of individual actors and works in historical accounts. In a 1903 article, Lamprecht clearly expressed his horror of the biographic-heroic, contending that a history without names was far more suitable to the modern age. "What, today, are for us the names of a Pericles or an Augustus?" he queried. "Names, no more! Labels for great times."[98] Heinrich Wölfflin, too, called for an art history without names, substituting the search for stylistic characteristics for the connoisseur's preoccupation with great men. For Wölfflin and Lamprecht, as for Adler, the man or the work of art was to be considered symbolic rather than unique, more a cultural barometer than an end in itself.

Der Stil in der Musik, Adler's next major publication, aimed precisely at this sort of anonymous account of musical developments. Consciously recalling Gottfried Semper's *Der Stil in den technischen und tektonischen Künsten*, Adler set out to define the criteria by which stylistic categories could be imposed, emphasizing variances and adaption of "materials" within the limitations set by their unique qualities. If it is difficult to see precisely what Adler meant by "materials," it is clear that he is mimicking Semper's and also Riegl's studies of the dynamics of design, seeking for the history of music an objective and investigable substratum beyond the single work, whose evolution could be traced over time to form a developmental sequence. All works, he argued, were to some degree stylized, stamped with the impress of their age, shot through with the techniques and technical possibilities at hand. Musical styles were to be understood under the logic of historical development, not, as for Hanslick, under static natural laws of musical syntax.

Along with dogmatic aesthetics, music history was to purge itself of biographic idolatry; concentration on great men (after the fashion of Kiesewetter), Adler claimed, obscured the true evolutionary nature of the musical arts, failing to trace as it should "out of the knot of artistic phenomena the red thread of history. . . ."[99] This overrating of masters and underestimation of the power of traditions and convention, he charged, was the product of the intrusion of the unqualified amateur into music history. Again deriding the *Schnellbiograph* he wrote: "Gradually today an almost hypocritical hero-cult presses forward that has the indolence, the blind impulses of the great masses in the realm of music to thank for its origin and expansion."[100] As Dvořák worried about the downward drag on the communal understanding effected by the efflorescence of dilettante and journalist chatter, Adler feared the corruption of musical science by inexpert interlopers.

[98]Karl Lamprecht quoted in Karl J. Weintraub, *Visions of Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), p. 164.

[99]Guido Adler, *Der Stil in der Musik* (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1911), p. 3.

[100]*Ibid.*, p. 3.

Adler intended his sequel to *Der Stil, Methode der Musikgeschichte* (1919), to delineate a history of periods of style. By the time of its composition, however, Adler still considered the methodological groundwork laid down in his first volume to be incomplete and felt compelled to fend off rearguard attempts by other disciplines to retake music-historical territory. Cultural historians, he admonished, even those schooled in the precise paleography of the *Institut für Geschichtsforschung*, could not adequately understand pieces of music without the ability, possessed by the musically trained alone, to determine the hidden architecture of style:

> . . . the most essential, the center point of music-historical work lies in the far-reaching and fundamental training for criticism and comparisons of style. The future of our science lies exclusively in the hands of professionally trained researchers; if other individual components (*Bausteine*) also may be brought forward, they can only be inserted into the total structure of our discipline by professionals.[101]

Whereas others had acted incautiously, heedlessly violating the "necessary self-sufficiency" of the separate provinces of cultural-historical investigation, "we music historians," Adler declared, "are not so spoiled, and therefore we retain . . . our independence, and wish to be conscious of this ourselves."[102]

Dedicated to Franz Wickhoff, Adler's book lauded the genetic approach developed by art historians to describe the working out of artistic problems not according to the action of causal laws in the natural sciences but within a different sort of causal nexus—that of creative possibilities, as in the *Geisteswissenschaften*. With scattered references to Dilthey, Mach and Rickert, among others, Adler argued that though natural necessity and necessity in art were not identical, the genius in art, like the accident in nature, could be explained by certain preconditions of time, place, and agency; the accident was to the law of nature as the genius was to the "Gesamtverlauf der Kunsttatsachen." The extraordinary was to be explained by the ordinary; the unique, he contended, could still be seen as the "Begleiterscheinung" of the norm at a higher or lower level.[103]

Again, Adler lamented the inroads of aesthetics and cultural history, stressing the task of music history to indicate the status of the work in a developmental continuum. This organic understanding of art, he maintained, could be conceived as analogous to the investigations of the evolutionary biologist, within the parameter of musical science. "In the creation of forms,"

[101] Adler, *Methode der Musikgeschichte*, p. 5.
[102] *Ibid.*, p. 37.
[103] *Ibid.*, p. 29.

he wrote, "a quasi-biological ordering can be pointed out."[104] The structure of the individual work, he claimed, citing Oswald Köller's article "Die Musik im Lichte der Darwinischen Theorie," could be inspected under "the basic biogenetic rule of recapitulation," casting Mozart, for example, as the perfect embodiment and reflection of the evolution of the Viennese *Stilschule*.[105] On the level of composer and *Stilschule*, as on the level of single work and style, the part was imbued with the characteristics of the whole; the individual was to represent its ancestry, newly incorporated. Even as an explicit goal of the *Denkmäler der Tonkunst* series was the recovery and reconstruction of a forgotten heredity, so criticism of style was to document tradition, not revolution, streamlined developmental continuity, not punctuated aesthetic interest. Where Dvořák had raged against monographs and mere compilation of facts in his *Österreichische Kunsttopographie*, opting instead for a "genealogy of the present," so Adler spurned the *Schnellbiographie* and the lexicon and exalted genealogy of style as a means of transcending subjective polemics and aesthetic ideals.

After *Methode der Musikgeschichte*, Adler wrote only obituary notices and scattered articles in journals. He continued to edit *Denkmäler der Tonkunst* and organize conferences and festivals, to partake ritualistically of the afternoon *Jause* and take summer cures at Hofgastein.[106] His reforming days were over; his position and his discipline secure, he launched no new projects and seems to have become estranged from the political bureaucracy whose support he had, before the war, used to such great advantage. This does not mean, however, that Adler had abandoned his antebellum patriotism; his journal articles, while developing no new methodological outlook, continually celebrated the achievements of Austro-German, and particularly Viennese baroque, musical culture. Here he discovered a pervasive ethical impress, the outcome of the organic evolution of Germanic folk song into classical forms.[107]

His 1924 "Internationalismus in der Tonkunst" is, perhaps, most exemplary of his postwar work. The essay provides, in addition, an ideal example of what Michael Steinberg has called "nationalist cosmopolitanism."[108] It repeats incessantly the injunction against chauvinist particularism which,

[104]*Ibid.*, p. 44.

[105]*Ibid.*, p. 45.

[106]Engel, "Guido Adler in Retrospect," pp. 397, 393.

[107]See, for example, his essay on Haydn where he described the "liberating principle" of the eighteenth-century classical cadence, and the "ethical device" derived from Austrian folk character. Guido Adler, "Haydn and the Viennese Classical School," *The Musical Quarterly*, XVIII, no. 2 (April 1932), 191-207.

[108]Michael P. Steinberg, *The Meaning of the Salzburg Festival* (doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1985), p. 149.

Adler wrote, brings strife into the art world without furthering the cause of musical development. "Such was the case," he argued, "in the eighteenth century, during the rivalry between French and Italian music, the scene of the conflict being Paris. And while the two parties were at daggers' points about things of really trifling importance, the Germans assumed the leadership in music . . . J. S. Bach . . . attained a height to which all musically cultured nations still gaze with reverence."[109] Strangely enough, all the puerile, vexatious and obstructive chauvinisms that exert an unsettling effect on music evolution appear to be French and Italian; all the sublime synthesizers turn out to be Austrian or German. The most creative, universal and natural forces are revealed to be Bach, who scaled the heights of universality, and the Viennese Classical School, whose fitness allowed it to seize the natural essence, logical progression, and historical direction of occidental music. "Not every nationality," wrote Adler, "is destined to play a role in musical progress, to carry out a decisive, momentous mission,"[110] but among those who were so destined, the Austro-German *Volk* certainly led the charge.

Another striking aspect of this article is its celebration of the dual Judeo-Catholic origins of occidental polyphony. The genesis of polyphony had been a concern of Adler's since 1880. Now he described the fixing of the multivoice forms as a process of the appropriation and ritualization of Hebrew psalmody by the Roman Church, resulting in the creation of the indestructable edifice of the Christian chorale. Adler, still a practicing Jew, stressed the profound unity and significance of Jewish and Catholic contributions: "Of the chorale, as the most important basal element of Christian occidental music, it might be said, paraphrasing the words spoken of Peter, 'super hanc petram aedificata est ars musicae occidentalis' (upon this rock is built the art of occidental music)."[111] It is arresting, in fact, that aside from his methodological treatises, Adler's many essays dealt almost exclusively with Austro-German classicism (plus Wagner and Mahler, his personal friends) and early Christian polyphony. Although Adler attended scores of international conferences, read numerous languages, and had at his disposal all manner of French, Italian, Russian, and Czech works, either chauvinism or specialization prevented him from discussing these in print. Which of these prevailed cannot be determined, however. Arguing the superiority of the stylistically trained, expert ear, the mandarin, on the Adler model, finessed nationalist polemics as he had the battlefield of criticism and the bog of philosophical aesthetics.

[109]Guido Adler, "Internationalism in Music," *The Musical Quarterly*, XV, no. 1 (January 1925), 282-283.

[110]*Ibid.*, p. 282.

[111]*Ibid.*, p. 284.

Dvořák and Adler were Viennese scholars and devoted civil servants, Austrian patriots and professional watchdogs. Consequently, as might have been expected, they saw only catastrophe in the dissolution of the monarchy; their postwar writings betray an apocalyptic vision not evident in their earlier work.[112] Mannerism was pointed to as the great parallel of the broken, unnatural, distorted postwar period. And yet, their own discoveries of the continuity of past creativity, despite apparent caesurae, provided for the two historians the promise of cultural renewal. In the material collapse of his age, Dvořák saw a *ricorso* of mannerist spirituality. His last essay, "On El Greco and Mannerism," looked forward to a new, complete escape from Renaissance naturalism:

> Don Quixote was a pure idealist, as indeed was El Greco in the realm of art, for his work represents the peak of a European artistic movement which sought to replace the materialism of the Renaissance with a complete spiritual reorientation. . . . Today, this materialistic culture is approaching its end. I am thinking not so much of its external demise as of its inner collapse which, for over a generation now, we have been able to observe affecting every sphere of cultural life. . . . We have seen how both in literature and art there has been a turning point toward a spirituality freed from all dependence on naturalism, a tendency similar to that of the Middle Ages and the mannerist period. And, finally, one can observe in all cultural sectors a certain unity of events which is apparently directed by some mysterious law of human destiny towards a new, spiritual, anti-materialistic age.[113]

Some mysterious law now seemed to operate, too, in favor of *Weltanschauungstheorie*; if Dagobert Frey and Arnold Hauser cautioned against the overextention of Dvořák's *Zeitgeist* analogies, the art historian was now more than a technical expert. He was, as Panofsky wrote, a humanist.[114]

Adler, too, had comments to make about the current manneristic state of stylistic flux. "We discern a confusion and conflict of styles," he wrote. "The art of music tosses on the waves and eddies of a rapid. This movement has gained momentum since about 1890, and now seems to be nearing a crisis like that of a fever, that shall cleanse the body of music in the same way as at the beginning of the seventeenth century."[115] The last decades of musical experimentation, he charged, had produced works inimical to music's essential nature. Melodies had been piled upon one another only to effect "sham counterpoint;" harmonic relationships had been destroyed by extravagant com-

[112]For another discussion of Austrian art history in the throes of postwar pessimism, see Almut Krape-Weiler, "Zur Kunstpolitik des Tietze-Kreises," in *Geistiges Leben im Österreich der Ersten Republik* (Munich: Oldenbourg Verlag, 1986), pp. 76-103.

[113]Dvořák, *History of Art*, pp. 107-108.

[114]Erwin Panofsky, *Meaning in the Visual Arts* (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1955), p. 10.

[115]Adler, "Internationalism in Music," p. 294.

posers and amateur bunglers.[116] The over-zealousness of modern mannerism and nihilism, however, foreshadowed not inexpiable "Pillars of Hercules" transgression, but eventual incorporation; the lesson of the evolutionary chain was the comforting story of successive assimilation. "History records similar excesses toward the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries," he mused; "history teaches us that they were conducted into the proper channels and that their useful elements were taken over and assimilated by succeeding times."[117] The discipline of music history, like that of art history, was now a permanent fixture in academic life. Adler could look forward to a time when he, too, would conduct modern music into proper taxonomic channels and take over its useful elements for style-historical explication.

In *Mannerism*, Dvořák's student, Arnold Hauser, noted that while the reappraisal of the baroque and the appreciation of impressionism could only take place under a certain relaxation of the rules of classical aesthetics and naturalistic understanding, the acceptance of mannerism and expressionism implied a radical departure. "The development of mannerism marked one of the deepest breaks in the history of art," Hauser contended, "and its rediscovery implies a similar break in our own day. Indeed, the crisis that led to our acceptance of it was deeper than the crisis of the Renaissance which gave it birth."[118] For the Austrian cultural mandarins, the intellectual crisis which accompanied the development of aesthetic modernism was indeed more critical than that of the Renaissance; the dissolution of the Catholic, eclectic, monarchical *Weltanschauung* necessitated a full rethinking of Austria's cultural heritage. As Julius von Schlosser remarked of Riegl, Wickhoff, and their contemporaries, the antebellum Viennese art historian had been concerned with the Roman-Gothic-baroque continuum as an expression of Austrian *Heimatluft*.[119] Otto Brunner, too, saw in Vienna's wartime transition from formalism to *Weltanschauungstheorie* a *großösterreichisch* response to the complete breakdown of a unifying political ideal. Haunted by a sense of unstoppable social disintegration, Brunner argues, the academic bureaucrat could at least seek consolation in affirming the persistence of an "Austrian mind."[120] The exaltation of Roman art by Wickhoff and the reappraisal of Carolingian art by Dvořák, Hanslick's delight with the baroque, and Adler's preoccupation with Christian polyphony all spoke to a Catholic-

[116]*Ibid.*, p. 295.

[117]*Ibid.*, p. 293.

[118]Arnold Hauser, *Mannerism* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965), pp. 3-4.

[119]Schlosser, "Die Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte," p. 187.

[120]Otto Brunner, "Das Österreichische Institut für Geschichtsforschung und seine Stellung in der deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, LII (1938), 412.

eclectic-caesaristic cultural tradition with its roots deep in the imperial monarchy. This baroque tradition now faced, in the guise of the First Republic, an intellectual and social disjuncture tantamount, in their minds, to a resurgence of the Reformation.

By the time of this confrontation with a new, mannerist political and intellectual constellation, a revolution in art and music scholarship had taken place. With the articulation of art and music history as autonomous disciplines of high seriousness and with their firm entrenchment in the pantheon of academic sciences came a thoroughgoing revision of art analysis, one intent upon verifying cultural continuity and legitimizing a science of art. Stylistic criticism, disabused of aesthetic polemics, gathered and displayed the works of past civilizations much as Napoleon had collected and exhibited the treasures of Europe and Egypt, demonstrating the control of the cosmopolitan compiler of vast resources. Napoleon, writes William Ivins, "did this not so much because of the artistic importance of his loot, as because it enabled him to demonstrate to both France and the world that he had been able to assemble in Paris the objects held most holy by the peoples of Europe. There was no comparable way of symbolizing the prowess of the Empire and the French."[121] For the historian of the arts, there was no means comparable to stylistic taxonomy by which to symbolize his competence to both academia and Austria. Constructing evolutionary and explanatory chains of artistic development, he used professional neutrality and bureaucratic expertise to make his vision intellectually and socially operative. Legitimacy for this new man depended upon his prowess in adjusting his cultural capital to represent his power of inclusion and mastery; the invisible hand implicit in the historically educated eye and the stylistically trained ear was that of the cultural mandarin.

University of Chicago SUZANNE L. MARCHAND

[121]William M. Ivins, *Prints and Visual Communication* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1969), p. 140.